

ITEM # 4

The examiner stated:

"3. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: Under a (c) section, there were (e), (d), and (e) should be corrected. Appropriate correction is required.

Response:

Claim 1 has been modified accordingly. See attached "Revised Copy with Modifications."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC Section 112

ITEMS #5-9

The examiner stated:

"5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claim 1 recites the limitation "a collapsible stroller" in line 6, it is not clear, whether this stroller is the same with a collapsible baby stroller in line 1, and "a handle" in line 1. It is unclear, whether this handle is the same with "the handles" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

8. Claim 6 recites the limitation "a collapsible stroller" in line 12, it is not clear whether this stroller is the same with "a collapsible baby stroller" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

9. Claim 7 recites the limitation "a collapsible stroller" in line 2, it is not clear, whether this stroller is the same with "a collapsible baby stroller" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim."

Response for Items 5-8:

Claims 1-6 have been modified accordingly. See attached "Revised Copy with Modifications."

Response for Item 9:

Claim 7 has been withdrawn. See attached "Revised Copy with Modifications."